

1. As I have noted before and as articulated by Harry O., I always appreciate how well the BOG group reconcile their various programmatic agendas and work together for the betterment of all. It doesn't often work that way.
2. Early in the meeting there was a discussion about adding composite bass samples for PCB analysis and increasing the number of fish in the composites to 10. That was followed by a conversation re. fish sizes I had trouble following. Regardless of sample size, reconciling the 75 percent rule and need for legal-sized (vs. eating-sized) fish against the desire to maximize the size range for the Hg regressions is an issue. I think it will require a separate group of fish.
3. I was surprised at the lack of pushback from the fish collectors and processors re increasing the number of fish. Sometimes it is as easy to collect 10 (or 20) fish of a given species and have them meet the size goals as it is to collect five, but not often. Not to mention doubling the volume of samples to be chilled, stored, and processed. There is also the public relations issue when you are dealing with killing large fish.
4. There was a conversation about 'unexpectedly' high Hg concentrations in white (?) catfish from someplace. That shouldn't be a surprise. White and channel catfish can and will be piscivorous given the opportunity, especially if they are large. As such, Hg concentrations in these spp. might be better evaluated on a size-normalized basis. Also note that these spp. were identified together with bullheads in the health advisory fact sheet, which is probably incorrect for at least some locations; bullheads are pretty much universally benthivorous, but not necessarily white and channel catfish.
5. There was an issue re. species such as lmb that are classified as both game and forage species that has been resolved for ongoing and future collections. Past collections are being reconciled based on size (< 100 mm = forage). Does this work for smaller spp. (bluegill, pumpkinseed, etc.) that are both game and forage spp.?
6. The sampling for ducks is interesting and worthwhile from a human health perspective, but adds little to the overall effort. Unlike the grebe study, which was conducted at lakes where other data were being collected (e.g., forage and predatory fish) and yielded results that could be extrapolated to other lakes, the duck sites appear to be outliers relative to other aspects of the program.
7. The proposed post-fire sampling is also potentially interesting, but needs more planning. In particular, the list of analytes needs further careful consideration; in addition to anthropogenic substances and PAHs, many constituents are released from vegetation and soils after fires. And again, it would be good if at least some of this activity would support the larger effort (i.e., for Hg and Se).
8. And finally, the talk about adding a "shellfish" component was scary. Although it would be worth including for human health reasons, implementation will require a lot of careful planning. As you know, it isn't just a matter of adding samples. As daunting as the coastal fish component has been re. the number of taxa, at least the preparation methods are all the same and the analyte list is fairly short and uniform. For shellfish the list of

analytes will be longer (As, Cd, PAHs...). Then questions about which taxa (bivalves, crustaceans, whatever; which spp.)? Which parts (adductor muscles, whole, hepatopancreas,,)? Size(s)? Depurated, or as-captured (I always thought mussel watch was actually a suspended sediment monitoring program)? It almost needs to be a separate component. I suggest that you put together a group to work on it and consider implementing a small pilot project so we get some idea of how many of what kind of samples, etc. Then figure out how much it will cost to scale up. Regardless, it would nevertheless be more beneficial if it added value to the larger effort (contribution to understanding of contaminant flux, etc.) and not just another diversion/dilution of resources.